

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2017-292-WS

Blue Granite Water Company
Compliance Filing
Customer Complaint Resolution Report
April 1, 2019 – September 27, 2019

On May 30, 2018, the South Carolina Public Service Commission (“the Commission” or “PSC”) approved Blue Granite Water Company’s, (“BGWC” or “the Company”), formerly known as Carolina Water Service, Inc., request for an increase in general rates and charges for its water and sewer services. As part of its Order, the PSC provided that:

“...in order to ensure that the Company is being responsive to quality of service issues, and to its customers, BGWC shall prepare a report and submit it to the Commission and to ORS no less than semiannually, and the document should have headings for ‘Customer Complaint,’ ‘Company Response,’ ‘Customer Reaction to Company,’ and explain the Company reaction to Customer Complaints during the period addressed, along with any explanations regarding quality of service.”

The following report provides not only the information requested by the PSC but also metrics from BGWC’s call center operations for the first two quarters of 2019 to give a more in-depth view of the Company’s efforts to be responsive to its customers. This report contains details concerning (i) Customer Billing, (ii) Call Center Operations, (iii) Customer Complaints, and (iv) Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions.

The reporting period for this report is April 1, 2019 through September 27, 2019.

Chart 1: Customer Billing – This chart provides details on the number of bills issued each month and the accuracy of those bills. It also provides the average time it took to resolve bills that were in error.

Customer Billing

Performance Metrics	Jan Actual	Feb Actual	Mar Actual	1Q19 Actual	Apr Actual	May Actual	June Actual	2Q19 Actual	YTD
# of Bills Rendered	22086	21727	21811	65624	22052	21847	21912	65811	131435
% of Billing Accuracy	99.3%	98.9%	99.4%	99.2%	99.5%	99.6%	99.3%	99.5%	99.3%
Summary of Causes of Billing Adjustments									
Billed in Error	6	2	2	10	2	3	3	8	18
Rate Change	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wrong Bill Cycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wrong Customer Billed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wrong Period Billed	1	3	3	7	2	1	6	9	16
Wrong Rate	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wrong Read	151	240	130	521	109	79	151	339	860
# of Billing Exceptions	413	407	253	1073	382	292	407	1081	2154
Avg # of Days to Resolve Billing Exceptions	10.32	9.94	6.28	8.85	3.93	5.11	7.43	5.49	7.17

Chart 2: Call Center Operations – This chart provides details on how responsive customer service representatives are in handling calls. It includes the number of calls received each month and how quickly those calls are answered.

Call Center Operations

Performance Metrics	Jan Actual	Feb Actual	Mar Actual	1Q19 Actual	Apr Actual	May Actual	June Actual	2Q19 Actual	YTD
# of Calls Received at all Centers	4427	3641	4164	12232	3721	4614	3619	11954	24186
*Average Speed of Answer / Service Level	78.5%	78.4%	55.4%	70.8%	82.4%	84.7%	78.5%	81.9%	76.3%
Abandon Rate	2.2%	2.7%	8.0%	4.3%	2.6%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%	3.2%
Longest Wait Time in Queue	0:08:53	0:11:24	0:13:51	0:13:51	0:12:44	0:09:48	0:10:34	0:12:44	0:13:51
Average Wait Time	0:00:43	0:00:43	0:01:52	0:01:06	0:00:41	0:00:33	0:00:47	0:00:40	0:00:53
Average Customer Treatment Time	0:10:49	0:05:33	0:05:17	0:07:13	0:05:18	0:04:38	0:04:46	0:04:54	0:06:03

*The Company is reporting against a Target Average Speed of Answer Service Level of 80% of all calls answered within 60 seconds of entering queue. The Company has been performing at this level since 01/01/2013.

Chart 3: Customer Complaints – This chart provides details on the actual complaints received from customers and the reasons for the complaints. The complaint rate is measured by dividing the number of complaints by the number of active customer accounts. These complaints are considered resolved unless they are either escalated to the Community Relations Coordinator or a complaint comes through the ORS for investigation by the Community Relations Coordinator. See Chart 4 for those complaints.

Customer Complaints

Performance Metrics	Jan Actual	Feb Actual	Mar Actual	1Q19 Actual	Apr Actual	May Actual	June Actual	2Q19 Actual	YTD
# of Complaints Received	298	184	198	680	214	312	220	746	1426
% of Unresolved Complaints Issued Notice to Contact ORS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Complaint Rate	1.37%	0.84%	0.91%	1.04%	0.98%	1.42%	1.00%	1.13%	1.09%
Types and Number of Types of Calls Received from BGWC Customers									
High Bill Investigation	74	51	63	188	52	48	54	154	342
Air in Water	6	1	2	9	1	1	1	3	12
Clogged Sewer	18	12	16	46	24	13	13	50	96
Discolored Water	10	4	2	16	7	20	7	34	50
General Investigation	45	14	21	80	18	27	27	72	152
High or Low Pressure in the Water	15	10	3	28	15	43	11	69	97
Lawn Repair for Sewer Breaks	0	2	1	3	1	3	0	4	7
Lawn Repair for Water Breaks	3	2	2	7	1	7	1	9	16
Lift Station Problems	1	1	0	2	0	2	3	5	7
Mineral Amount in Water	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
No Water	12	9	10	31	14	54	11	79	110
Noise in Sewer	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Odor in Sewer	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	9	9
Repair/Replace Meter Box	2	3	2	7	3	3	4	10	17
Repair Road	5	1	3	9	1	5	2	8	17
Sewer Main Break	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	3
Sewer Miscellaneous Complaint	28	20	17	65	9	7	7	23	88
Sewer Service Line Break	1	4	1	6	1	3	3	7	13
Taste or Odor in the Water	1	2	2	5	0	2	2	4	9
Water Quality	2	4	4	10	1	2	0	3	13
Water Main Break	8	3	5	16	5	6	4	15	31
Water Miscellaneous Complaint	26	8	16	50	18	24	20	62	112
Water Service Line Break	20	23	24	67	27	27	39	93	160
Test Meter	21	8	4	33	10	9	10	29	62

Chart 4: Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions – This chart provides details on all the calls that are either escalated by BGWC Customer Service to the Community Relations Coordinator for resolution or through a complaint received by a customer through the ORS. Pursuant to the Commission’s Order No. 2018-345(A) in Docket No. 2017-292-WS, the chart below provides the customer complaint, Company response, customer reaction and resolution date. The Company began tracking these complaints as of the Order date, May 30, 2018. The reporting period for this report is April 1, 2019 through September 27, 2019.

Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions

Customer Name	Customer Complaint	Company Response	Customer Reaction	Resolution Date
Mike Walker	The Company received this complaint through the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Walker disputed being charged an irrigation fee.	The Company found that the customer had been overcharged a total of \$114.67. This overcharge came from an irrigation charge that was discontinued when new rates went into effect on 7/4/2018. The Company credited the customer’s account a total of \$114.67 to account for the overcharged amount. The customer’s account was fixed to ensure he would not be charged this fee moving forward.	This complaint came through the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the customer. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	3/29/2019
Diane Campbell	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Campbell called to complain about facing disconnect after a payment was made.	The Company found that the payment in question was received after the disconnection notice was sent to the customer. Once the payment was received, the collection process was cancelled, and the customer's service was not disconnected.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	3/29/2019

Sylvia Smith	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Smith called to complain that she was told she could pay part of her account balance on 4/11/19 and the remaining balance on 4/30/19 to avoid disconnection of service, and then when she called to make the payment a customer service representative told her that could not be done.	The Operations team contacted the customer service team to ensure the requested arrangement could be done for this customer. Customer service made the change on the account and the customer was not disconnected.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	4/4/2019
Patricia Parrish	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Parrish filed a complaint at the Public Service Commission that was forwarded to the ORS. Ms. Parrish complained that the Hamilton Bay Apartment Complex changed their water rates to a flat rate without proper legal authority.	The Company confirmed that the Hamilton Bay Apartment Complex is served and billed by master meters. The apartment complex is billed and then the residents of the complex are billed by apartment complex. This makes the residents of the Hamilton Bay Apartment Complex secondary customers of the Company, removing any control over how the residents are billed.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	4/17/2019
Richard Horsley	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Mr. Horsley called to dispute that the Company was reading his meter and charging him for actual usage.	The Company found that the customer's meter was misread on 2/9/2019. A verified read was gathered by the Company's operations staff and the customer was rebilled for correct usage. The following bill was generated by a verified meter read, indicating the customer was being billed for actual usage.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	4/18/2019

Gail McLean	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. McLean called to complain that her service was disconnected without notice.	The Company found that an operator disconnected the wrong address. Once this was identified, the customer's service was restored immediately.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	4/23/2019
Heather Woo	Ms. Woo contacted the Company to complain that her service was disconnected but she was up to date on her payments.	Upon investigation, the Company found that the customers payments were being made, but a going to a different account. The customer was putting the incorrect account number on her payments. This was not another customer's account, but an empty account that received all the deposits. This was corrected immediately. A Company representative spoke with the customer to get the issue resolved and ensured that the customer was sending payments to the correct account.	The customer was happy that the issue was resolved, and the issue would not happen again.	4/23/2019
Shawn Becker	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Mr. Becker complained that he had been overcharged by the Company and has not yet seen any credit or reimbursement.	The Company found that the customer had been overbilled based on an estimated meter read. The proper read was not taken in the billing window, which generated an estimated read for the customer. A verified read was taken by our operations staff and the customer's high bill was cancelled and he was then rebilled for actual usage. Rebilling the customer corrected the customer's account balance.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	5/13/2019

Sandra Burke	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Burke called to complain about the mandatory non-essential water ban in effect in the Lake Wylie area.	A Company representative called the customer to explain why the ban was necessary and what the Company was doing to address the issue.	The customer was frustrated with the ban but understood the issue. The customer requested to receive confirmation when the ban was lifted.	5/24/2019
Katherine Hauser	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Hauser called to complain about the price of service, the quality of our water and the irrigation ban in effect for the Lake Wylie area.	The Company responded to the customer by explaining that she is charged for service in accordance with the most recently approved rates and that her water meets all standards set by SC DHEC. The Company also provided the customer with the conservation schedule in place in the Lake Wylie area.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	6/4/2019
Bruce Cobb	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Mr. Cobb called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the meter reads were in line, indicating that the customer had not been charged for any water that did not go through the meter. The customer's meter was tested by the ORS and found to be in compliance with the standards of the Public Service Commission. No adjustment was made on the customer's account.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	6/10/2019
Judith LoTruglio	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. LoTruglio complained that under the conservation schedule in the Lake Wylie area, developers could irrigate at all times while homeowners were held to a strict schedule.	The Company provided a response to the customer explaining that developers are held to the same schedule as individual homeowners.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	6/11/2019

Shandrea Thompson	Ms. Thompson called to complain about her sewage service being disconnected.	Upon investigation, it was determined that the customer's service was disconnected erroneously. The service was reconnected immediately. The disconnection caused a slight backup. The Company credited the customer's account \$125.	A Company representative spoke with the customer. The customer was appreciative of the Company speaking with her and taking care of the issue.	6/14/2019
John Ness	Mr. Ness contacted the Company to complain about being overcharged.	The Company found that the customer was being charged for two Single Family Equivalents for wastewater service. The customer was credited the overcharged amount. The Company's system was updated to ensure the customer was being charged the correct amount for wastewater service.	A Company representative spoke with the customer to explain the issue and ensure that everything was fixed.	6/16/2019
Nancy White	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. White complained that the Company did not check fire hydrants in the area and the hydrants have no pressure.	The Company found that it is not required to provide fire flow in the area in question. The hydrants the customer was referring to are flushing hydrants.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/3/2019
John Martin	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Mr. Martin called to complain about a leak in the Dutchman Shores community.	The Company found that it was in fact a leak on the Company line. Once identified and confirmed, a contractor repaired the leak.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/5/2019

Ashley Endy	Ms. Endy contacted the Company to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's meter had been read incorrectly. The large bill was cancelled, and a new bill was created based on actual usage.	A Company representative spoke with the customer about the issue and was happy that it was resolved.	7/9/2019
Robert Fagnant	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Mr. Fagnant called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's meter reads were in line and the meter is accurate, as it was a new meter. The Company placed a \$20 credit on the customer's account to account for flushing on the date of the meter exchange.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/12/2019
April Dashiel	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Dashiel complained about a high bill, not getting credit for making payments on her account, and being disconnected without notice.	The Company found that the customer only pays the minimum requirement to get reconnected each month, leaving a balance on her account. Also, the customer was given a disconnection notice four times prior to disconnection of service.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/15/2019
Mindy Capotospi	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Capotospi called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer was not due an adjustment. The ORS tested the meter and found it to be in compliance. The customer's meter reads in also in line.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/18/2019

Michael Tatham	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Mr. Tatham called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's reads were in line and the meter was accurate. The customer was not offered an adjustment.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	7/24/2019
Ronnie and Kathleen Pendleton	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Mr. and Mrs. Pendleton called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the read in question was verified and in line. The meter was also tested and found to be in compliance. The Company placed a \$150 credit on the customer's account to account for any late fees associated with this investigation.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/2/2019
Denise Latham	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Latham disputed a high bill and questioned a meter read.	The Company found that the meter reads were in line and the meter was accurate. The Company provided a \$50 for any inconvenience during the investigation.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/5/2019
Laura Sullivan	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Sullivan contacted the Public Service Commission to complain about inaccurate meter reading.	The Company found that the customer's meter was misread. A correct meter read was taken and the customer was rebilled based on actual usage.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/7/2019
Letha and Mike Riffle	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Mr. And Ms. Riffle called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the high bill was caused by an incorrect meter read. The Company obtained a verified read and rebilled the customer to reflect actual usage.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/8/2019

Nancy Bradley	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Bradley called to complain about being held accountable for a bill from 2008.	The Company found that the bill in question was related to a bill from an inactive account, which means that the customer did not live at that address anymore. The Company cancelled out the bill and zeroed out her account.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/8/2019
Christian Risley-Curtiss	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Risley-Curtiss called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer had no leaks, the reads were in line and the meter was accurate. The customer was not offered a adjustment.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/15/2019
Denise Cochran	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Cochran called to dispute high bills and inquire about incorrect meter reading.	The Company found that the customer's meter had been misread. Once this was determined, a correct read was taken and was used to rebill the customer. This resulted in an adjustment on the customer's account.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/16/2019
John McGrew	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Mr. McGrew called to complain that his meter was not being read correctly.	The Company found that the customer's meter had been misread. Once this was determined, a correct read was taken and was used to rebill the customer. This resulted in an adjustment on the customer's account.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/21/2019
Rita Aken	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Aken contacted the Public Service Commission to complain about meter reading and incorrect billing.	The Company found that the customer's reads were line, which indicated the meter reads are correct. The Company also explained the charges on the customer's bill. No credit was offered to this customer.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/26/2019

Barbara Sellers	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Sellers called to complain about meter reading and high bills.	The Company found that the customer's meter was misread on the low end, causing some usage to be unreported. Then when the meter was read correctly, the unreported usage was accounted for, creating a large bill. The customer's account was credited to address the inconvenience of this issue.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/28/2019
Frank Sanders	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Mr. Sanders called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's meter was misread on the low end, causing some usage to be unreported. Then when the meter was read correctly, the unreported usage was accounted for, creating a large bill. The customer's account was credited to address the inconvenience of this issue.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/29/2019
Rebecca Curry	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Curry called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's meter was misread on the low end, causing some usage to be unreported. Then when the meter was read correctly, the unreported usage was accounted for, creating a large bill. The customer's account was credited to address the inconvenience of this issue.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	8/29/2019
Annita Button	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> Ms. Button called to dispute a high bill and have her meter tested.	The Company found that the meter reads were in line and the meter was accurate. The Company provided a credit for any inconvenience during the investigation.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	9/13/2019

Doris Steward	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Steward called to dispute a high bill.	The Company found that the customer's meter reads were in line and the meter in question was accurate. This indicates that the customer was not charged for any water that did not go through the meter. No adjustment was made on the customer's account.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	9/23/2019
Tracy Meyers	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Meyers called to inquire about a reimbursement due to her from the Company.	The customer was overcharged at the time she stopped service. The reimbursement had been delayed in our system. Upon receiving this complaint, the Company expedited the process to mail the check to the customer.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	9/23/2019
Marcia Pierce	<u>ORS Complaint</u> : Ms. Pierce called to dispute a high bill and have her meter tested.	The Company found that the meter reads were in line and the meter was accurate. The Company provided a credit for any inconvenience during the investigation.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	9/24/2019